DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 512 IR 008 106

TITLE	Final Report from the State Dissemination Capacity Building Project Directors on Priorities and Needs and Including Recommendations toward a Nationwide Dissemination Configuration.
INSTITUTION	New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE	2 Mar 79
NOTE	41p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Education: *Information Dissemination; *National Programs; *Needs Assessment; *State Programs; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Information Network

ABSTRACT

The result of the work of the Select Committee on State Dissemination Capacity Building from August 1978 through February 1979, this report deals with the conditions which the directors assume are necessary to the success of a nationwide dissemination configuration, the needs identified by the state through a two-stage assessment process, and the recommendations which the directors have made, based upon the conditions and needs assessment. The recommendations comprise the main body of the report: several recommendations not receiving the consensus of the directors, but recognized by them to be of potential usefulness in the creative design of a nationwide configuration, are included in an appendix. Also appended are 16 suppositions (which may be viewed as recommendations by those interested in the development of the configuration), the results of the needs analysis, the 15 top priorities, the lowest five priorities, and a listing of agencies in terms of major responsibilities. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED184512

IR

FINAL REPORT FROM

THE STATE DISSEMINATION CAPACITY BUILDING PROJECT DIRECTORS

ON PRIORITIES AND NEEDS AND INCLUDING

RECOMMENDATIONS

TOWARD A NATIONWIDE DISSEMINATION CONFIGURATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert M. Trombley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

March 2, 1979

IR008106

CONTENTS

I. Introduction to Report

II. Recommendations of Project Directors

III. Conclusion

Appendix A. Recommendations Not Receiving Consensus of Project Directors

- Recommendations Addressed to NIE
- Recommendations Addressed to USOE

Appendix B. Developmental Suppositions

Appendix C. Assessment of Needs and Responsibilities

Executive Summary

This final report from State Capacity Building Project Directors results from the work of the Select Committee on State Dissemination Capacity Building from August, 1978, through February, 1979.

The report deals with the conditions which the Directors assume are necessary to the success of a nationwide dissemination configuration, the needs identified by the states through a two stage assessment process, and the recommendations which the Directors are making based upon the conditions and needs assessment.

The Directors' recommendations comprise the main body of the report. In addition, several recommendations not receiving concensus of the Directors but recognized by them to be of potential usefulness in the creative design of a nationwide dissemination configuration, are included in Appendix A.

The sixteen "developmental suppositions" found in Appendix B may also be viewed as recommendations by those interested in the development of the configuration.

The results of the needs analysis are presented in Appendix C as are the fifteen top priorities, the five lowest priorities, and a listing of agencies in terms of their major responsibilities.

I. Introduction To Report

There is a story told to new students of Zen concerning a wandering monk and two brothers. It seems that provided he makes and wins an argument about Buddhism with those who live there, any wandering monk can remain in a Zen temple for the rest of his life. If he is defeated, he has to move on.

In northern Japan lived two brothers who were the only resident monks for a small village temple. The elder brother was quite wise, but the younger one was stupid and had but one eye.

An itinerant monk came to the village and liked its people and scenery so well that he went to the temple and asked for lodging, properly challenging them to a debate about Zen teachings. The older brother, tired that day from much studying, told the younger one to take his place but to pose as being deaf and dumb.

The young monk and the stranger went to the shrine to debate teachings in silence.

Shortly afterwards the traveler rose and went to the elder brother and said: "Your young brother is a wonderful fellow. He defeated me in argument."

"Relate the dialogue to me," said the elder one.

"Well," explained the traveler, "first I held up one finger, representing Buddha, the enlightened one. So your brother held up two fingers, signifying the Buddha and his teaching. I held up three fingers, representing Buddha, his teaching and his followers, living the harmonious life. Then he shook his fist in my face, indicating that all three are one. Thus your deaf and dumb brother has won the debate and I have no right to remain with you." Upon saying this the traveler left.

"Where did he go?" asked the younger one, running up to his elder brother.

"I understand your arguments were better."

"Better nothing. When I find him I am going to beat him up!"

"Tell me what happened," said the wise brother.

"Why, when he looked at me he held up one of his fingers, insulting me by taking notice of

the fact that I only had one eye. Since I thought him to be a good Buddhist, I thought that I would be polite to him, so I held up two of my fingers, congratulating him on the fact that he had two good eyes. Then the no-good bounder held up three fingers to tell me that between the two of us we only have three eyes. So I got mad and started to punch him, but he got up and left with me shaking my fist."

The Zen story of trading dialogue for lodging points out an embarrassing flaw in human nature, in that an occurrence or behavior may be explained differently by two individual observers. This is not always bad, indeed if we all agreed it could easily mean that we were all wrong.

The State Capacity Building Project Directors understand this fact and have considered it as we endeavored to finalize a set of program assumptions, needs and recommendations which would assist planners in the development of a nationwide dissemination configuration. This information was prepared based upon a charge given the directors of State Dissemination Capacity Building grants on August 18, 1979, by Dr. Ed Ellis of the National Institute of Education

Following the National Testing Service project directors' meeting at the 1978 National Dissemination Forum, Dr. Ellis addressed the directors stating some concerns which he had in working with the Capacity Building Program.

The outcome of this meeting was the establishment of the Select Committee to make recommendations in the name of the project directors on the following issues:

--Development of a permanent advisory/communication structure to provide state input for dissemination capacity building in its broadest sense;

--Analysis of current communication linkage between and among the project directors;

--Analysis of current communication with the chiefs relative to dissemination;

--Analysis of current communication linkages with other dissemination actors;

--Analysis of the future of the state dissemination programs.

Four directors were named to the Select Committee by the attending project directors:

Charles Brown (Idaho), Virginia Cutter (Texas), Joan Miller (New York), and Norman Sims (Kentucky), chairperson. Subcommittees were formed by the committee chairman for the purpose of addressing particular issues and concerns. The work of these subcommittees is also reflected in this report. The subcommittees are:

--Subcommittee on Communication with the Chiefs. The subcommittee was to address such questions as: Is there a reason for concern relevant to the chiefs' understanding and support for the dissemination function? If there is such a reason for concern, what measures can be taken to improve the situation?

Chairperson, Diane Wilson (Colorado)

--Subcommittee on Communication Between and Among Project Directors. How can we improve communication and use improved communication systems to aid the states in consensus reaching and unified action?

Chairperson, Roy Tally (Minnesota)

--Subcommittee on Communication with other Dissemination Actors. How can we communicate to actors within NIE, OE and other relevant publics, the nature and importance of the state dissemination program?

Chairperson, Elmer Knight (South Carolina)

--Subcommittee on the Future of the State Dissemination Program. What should be the purpose of the Capacity Building Program? When should its job be completed? What sorts of programs should be developed for the states beyond the Capacity Building Program?

Chairperson, Nancy Flott (Kansas)

The approach taken by the Committee was to prepare a report indicative of the types of programs and the administrative structure best prepared to meet the needs identified by the states. The report was also meant to indicate the types of programs to which the states could give their greatest support. This is not to say that the states would not support other schema as well, but that the closer the

nationwide configuration comes to implementing the recommendations outlined in the body of the report, more support they feel the configuration would receive from the states.

The draft of this report was then submitted to the Project Directors for their review, evaluation, revision and final approval. Herewith the Directors submit their considered recommendations, with supporting documentation regarding prioritized needs and a set of developmental suppositions or conditions assumed inherent to the success of the configuration to grow from the set of recommendations.

As was pointed out above, one of the lessons the Zen student is to learn from the story of the wandering monk and the two brothers is that one action may have more than one interpretation. Interpretations of the Directors' recommendations will be numerous, but every reader should realize that the intent is only to present one "menu" of actions which could meet identified needs while at the same time building a system beneficial to school children of the United States.

II. Recommendations

Based upon the developmental suppositions and the needs analysis discussed in the Appendices, the Directors make 23 recommendations regarding future dissemination configurations and activities. These recommendations involve state and federal dissemination programs and, if implemented, would affect NIE, USOE and the SEAs.

The recommendations follow:

Recommendation 1

Mechanisms should be designed and implemented by NIE, USOE, SDLP, AND CCSSO for enhancing and enriching communications with chief state school officers regarding dissemination. Improved communication can only be beneficial and the need should be addressed by NIE, USOE, SDLP and CCSSO directly.

Recommendation 2

Notification regarding all federal RFPs or contract announcements which require or contain a dissemination component should be automatically forwarded to the dissemination director of each state. If there is no designated director, notification should be sent to each chief with a memorandum suggesting that he/she inform all dissemination related staff.

Recommendation 3

As new state dissemination projects are approved, each should receive a full and comprehensive "background packet" of materials related to the conduct and the philosophy of the program. Likewise, extant projects should be advised of new member projects and the emphasis of each new grant so that older members can give assistance as appropriate to their abilities.

Recommendation 4

At least an annual meeting of state capacity building project directors, NIE project monitors, and program officers should be held, supported by NIE in such a way as to enable every project

director to attend. This meeting should address the current concerns and needs of the program as a whole and be based on a sensing of each projects' need for assistance. It is further recommended that this activity be conducted through the Central Dissemination Support Service with the creation of a State Capacity Building Program (SCBP) Steering Committee. These groups would become the advisory and organizing agents for the meeting.

Recommendation 5

The SCBP Steering Committee should be elected by the project directors and should continue to represent the concerns of past and current SCBP through the balance of the current SCBP program. A budget for the committee's operation should be provided through the Dissemination and Improvement of Practice Program as it is responsible for the state program.

The committee would be responsible for conducting the collection of data, transmitting consensus documents, reporting to the project directors, assisting in the publishing of a communication document, and planning an annual meeting of the directors of past and current SCBP projects.

Recommendation 6

A periodic, formal method of communicating with the SCBP project directors should be encouraged and supported by NIE. The communication should focus on NIE program development news from the projects, and pertinent legislative information which would impact on the projects and programs.

Recommendation 7

The Regional Programs branch of DIPs should initiate formation of an advisory committee composed of one representative from each of the major programs within the branch.

Recommendation 8

Provision of technical assistance should be a primary consideration in future dissemination capacity building funding. Serious attention should be given to this repeated request from the directors for extended technical assistance and major emphasis should be placed on this area by NIE.

Recommendation 9

The states should develop a commitment to dissemination which is expressed in budgets, staffing, and development of a long range plan for dissemination.

Capacity building programs should be planned and implemented with the clear intent of institutionalizing them at the end of the project period.

Recommendation 10

NIE should carry out its commitment to the State Capacity Building Program until all states desiring to participate have been funded. Some form of State Capacity Building Program grants should remain under a new format to assist the states after the FY 1980 funding cycle.

Recommendation 11

The states must support the agencies which are working in their behalf to express the needs and desires of the state programs. The states must give oversight to the workings of these agencies, follow their progress, keep their policy and planning committees informed, and hold them accountable for the work they are to do.

Recommendation 12

Under a new nationwide configuration for dissemination, the state education agencies should have responsibility for all general administrative programs relative to dissemination within their state boundaries as well as dissemination activities which cross program lines. The federal government should not plan programs with the effect of circumventing legal and historical state prerogatives. The states should live up to this responsibility.

Recommendation 13

(See Appendix A)

Recommendation 14

(See Appendix A)

Recommendation 15

(See Appendix A)

Recommendation 15-A

(See Appendix A)

Recommendation 16

USOE regional offices should assume a field driven technicdl assistance in regard to the development of state dissemination plans.

Recommendation 17

(See Appendix A)

Recommendation 18

The Directors suggest the establishment of a National Dissemination Leadership Office (NDLO). The NDLO would encompass two mission activities:

A. The National Dissemination Technical Assistance Program, and B. The National Dissemination Leadership Secretariat for Planning, Policy and Program.

Recommendation 19

(See Appendix A)

Recommendation 20

(See Appendix A)

Recommendation 21

The Directors recommend that NIE explore various models for accomplishing its purposes in dissemination through initiating innovative program designs such as those found in Appendices A and C of this report. While Recommendations 13, 17, 19 & 20 did not receive concensus, the Directors recognize their potential usefulness in stimulating discussion toward creative program configurations.

Recommendation 22

The Directors recommend that USOE explore accomplishing its purposes in dissemination through initiating innovative program design and restructuring of the NDN program is suggested in

Recommendations 14, 15, and 15-A in Appendix A of this report. While these Recommendations did not receive consensus, the Directors recognize their potential usefulness in stimulating discussion toward creative program configurations.

Recommendation 23

The Directors finally recommend that the material in this report as approved by them be shared with NIE staff, including all project monitors, program managers and the DIP Associate Director. They also recommend that the material be shared with appropriate OE, CCSSO and SDLP staff since these groups would be directly or indirectly affected by the implementation of any or all of these recommendations.

III. Conclusion

Administrators who work across governmental levels often find themselves in situations analogous to the story of the one-eyed monk and the wanderer. Problems arise more because of a lack of understanding than because of actual conflicts of opinion. Firm understanding of opinions and attitudes usually encourage cooperation.

It is the hope of the Project Directors that the assumptions and recommendations promulgated through this report will encourage understanding between state dissemination directors and the agencies with which they interact. Those agencies should realize that without a clear program direction those individuals affected by the program will read intentions into it which do not exist. The challenge is now to all actors to prepare a schema for the nationwide configuration to which all involved in the process of school improvement can react. Without such a document programs will continue to be developed on a piecemeal basis and conflicts will continue to arise.

Appendix A
Recommendations Not Receiving Consensus of the Project Directors

Recommendation 13

Each state should develop at least a three year plan for dissemination which should become a prerequisite for receiving federal funds earmarked for dissemination. Each state should also have responsibility for describing activities carried out under the plan in an annual report to be transmitted to the state Chief, The CCSSO, NIE, and USOE.

Each state should show a firm commitment to this plan as indicated by actions discussed in Recommendation 9.

Recommendation 14

The US Office of Education should establish a unified dissemination program voucher system. Under this system each state would be eligible for a funds voucher with the amount contained in the voucher based upon the state's public school enrollment. The current Title IV formula could also be used.

This program would be similar to the present Title V program in that it would allow and encourage a coordinated use of funds for the purpose of dissemination.

Such a program would not require new funds, but would allow percentage amounts of funds to be taken from programs which have mandated dissemination requirements within their regulations (e.g., Title I, Title IV, P.L. 94-142, Vocational Education Act, Career Education Act, Teacher Centers Program, Bilingual Education Program, Food and Nutrition Program) and spent in a coordinated manner as presented in the state's three year dissemination plan.

SEAs would be given the option of accepting the voucher payment, as in a block grant, or could continue to receive funds in the same manner as they now do. In either case, however, the percentage of funds to be spent on dissemination would remain a fixed percentage of administrative support funds.

Recommendation 15

The National Diffusion Network should be institutionalized by USOE as an entitlement program for dissemination and diffusion. All states should be entitled to a basic funding level pursuant to the submission and adoption of an acceptable state plan for dissemination which includes an NDN component.

NDN should be a part of the coordinated state dissemination program. NDN does not readily become a part of a coordinated state planning program while it remains a year-to-year project activity.

States with state validation programs should be authorized to use NDN entitlement funds for the diffusion of state validated programs as well as federally (JDRP) validated programs.

Recommendation 15-A

The Office of Education should encourage and support the establishment of a state product/practice clearinghouse relative to state validated programs.

Recommendation 17

The National Institute of Education should establish a state innovative program voucher which would supplement current RDx funding procedures. Under the voucher program, NIE could distribute discretionary funds currently being expended through non-mandated dissemination activities conducted by educational labs and centers as part of the RDx system. Distribution of funding vouchers (as token economy letters of credit) would be made to the states on a per pupil allotment basis. The voucher tokens would be used only to provide direct services to educational clients utilizing innovative or exemplary techniques in the state's three year dissemination plan. The vouchers would only be spent to purchase services from RDx labs and centers or any other configurations which have been certified by NIE as serving the same regional function.

Voucher allocations would be earmarked according to priority areas determined by the National Dissemination Leadership Office (see recommendation 18). The following allocation priorities are suggested:

80% school improvement

15% unserved populations

5% state leadership/technical assistance

Such an approach would offer several advantages:

--a significant portion of the state and federal dissemination program would be placed on a market economy

--all states would be served without the necessity of artificial geographic boundaries

--information equity would be aided

--the system would become truly client driven

NIE should be encouraged to continue the client responsive programming of the Regional Exchange through increased support of expanded advisory committee activities and long range planning.

Recommendation 19

The current State Capacity Building Grant Program should continue througy FY 1980 (see Recommendation 11). Beginning FY 1981, all discretionary dissemination program funds (except those placed in a voucher program or NDLO) would be placed in a special purpose grant program.

Project funds directed toward the meeting of state needs should be distributed based upon a "needs" list developed by the Policy and Planning functions of the Secretariat.

Determination of project grant awards should be made by NIE in consultation with the Program function of the Secretariat.

Recommendation 20

The committee recommends that funds unexpended by the special purpose grants program and/or the innovative programs voucher be placed in a special account to be disbursed by the National Institute of Education for basic research in dissemination. These funds would be applied for as unsolicited proposals, but must be spent with the educational labs and centers or other certifified configurations. They will be transmitted to the labs or centers in addition to the funds for which states have already used their vouchers.

Appendix B

Developmental Suppositions

It is a condition of the nature of the planning and analysis process that certain factors and conditions must be presumed. Often these presumptions take on the cloak of something taken as being true simply because proof is lacking to indicate the contrary. In other cases reasonable evidence exists, in quantifiable or philosophic form, for supposing the thing should be true.

In discussions the Committee operated with a set of implied suppositions which have affected the final recommendations. These suppositions are presented to the reader by concensus of the Project Directors for three reasons: (1) We believe that the conditions described in the developmental suppositions are necessary to the success of the national configuration of school improvement through the dissemination of information; (2) the recommendations have been made using the suppositions and needs as a base on which to build. If a recommendation was contrary to one of the suppositions, it was rejected as not contributing to the success of the national configuration; (3) the list of suppositions should serve as caveat emptor regarding the mental set from which the recommendations come.

A supporting rational is included for each supposition.

1. It is important to develop a nationwide configuration for school improvement through Dissemination.*

If information is to have its greatest impact upon those who need it, it must be provided efficiently and effectively. Such efficiency must decrease as fragmentation increases. Fragmentation of dissemination programs can only be reduced if needless overlapping, duplication and competition is eliminated. The development of a collaborative structure of federal, state and local actors, keeping in mind the legal responsibilities each has in the education of

---

* The Committee draws the reader's attention to the fact that the term "nationwide configuration" is used purposefully to differentiate it from a "national system." Differences in this terminology has been fully discussed by other authors.

children, would be an important step toward a more effective system.

2. All dissemination projects should be viewed in terms of their contribution to this configuration.

It is the feeling of the Directors that decisions are sometimes made to add or delete dissemination programs based more upon discrete organizational conditions within the funding agency than upon the nature of the program and its contribution to the national configuration. Project programs which are supportive of the configuration and its goals should be retained, programs which are not should not be implemented.

3. The national configuration should be built with all actors understanding that the State Education Agency has the primary role in public school education.

There is often a tendency among administrators to locate authority within a delivery system based upon funding patterns rather than regulatory and legal mandates. This is not a problem when funding and constitutional responsibilities are coterminous, but it is a problem in cases where federal funding and state authority for education meet. Federal agencies should develop programs as part of the configuration keeping in mind the constitutional responsibility and authority granted the states. They should also remember that even if individuals disregard where this authority lies, the states' constituency will not allow the states to forget their individual responsibilities.

4. The configuration should be developed in such a way as to be client driven and quickly responsive to state needs.

Attention is often given to the notion that communication is improved when the information to be transferred meets the perceived needs of the receiver. Material which is disseminated should be selected based upon the client's need for the material and his or her capacity to use it. In this regard the nationwide configuration should be driven by its clients and be receiver oriented.

We should also remember that information only has value as long as it is current. Once a

client identifies a need, the problem the need reflects will not hang in stasis until someone "gets around" to solving it. Information which includes solutions must not be detained by organizational inertia.

5. Program subcomponents within the configuration should distribute monies equitably, without reliance on "individual strengths" or "political expediencies."

It is an unfortunate fact of bureaucratic life that the rich often get richer and the poor get poorer when project grants are made. Federal allocations which rely upon financial matches or the state offering a "critical mass" level program dictate that funding becomes related more to what the client has than what the client needs.

This becomes an even greater problem when national programs are being phased-in geographically. Should a program not be available with some equity, it should be reconsidered in light of its contribution to the configuration.

6. Federal program and project guidelines and regulations should facilitate long range SEA program and fiscal planning.

While support has been given to long range planning at the federal and state levels, current program guidelines and regulations often force state dissemination directors to plan only from one fiscal year to the next. Such planning does not increase program reliability and serves as a barrier to institutionalization. Federal programs, particularly those which involve grants, should include goals and objectives to be reached in terms of the national configuration, a means for testing those goals, a guaranteed period of funding, and a "sunset" provision which would outline phase-out procedures.

7. Within the configuration, programs which impact closest to the ultimate client should be given priority.

Operationally, State programs should serve the local level and federal programs should serve states. States should give priority to programs which impact upon local clients. The

federal government should give priority to programs which serve states.

8. Program and project development should give priority to approaches which decrease the "top loading" of the administrative system.

The subcomponents of the nationwide configuration should encourage the movement of responsibility for basic program operation from the federal level to the state level.

Indeed, state dissemination programs could be viewed as seeds. With proper support and care they can grow into agents which will be firm supporters of federal efforts as well as state responsibilities.

9. Programs within the configuration should facilitate feed-forward through a market economy.

To the greatest extent possible program services should be tested to determine the value placed upon the services by potential clients. The Directors believe that the best test of the relationship between service supply and demand is the market economy. Unfortunately present approaches to program development do not allow for a supply and demand test.

10. The programs within the configuration should build in structural approaches to accountability.

Every program which utilizes public monies should be accountable for the effective use of those funds. Programs should have inherent in them structural elements which insure that funds are supporting activities designed to meet identified needs. It is the feeling of the Committee that this accountability can best be met through a market or "token" economy.

11. The programs within the configuration should be structured in such a way as to improve the evaluation of program impact and allow continuous feedback for the purpose of planning.

This presumption seems significantly self-explanatory. Again it is believed that this purpose can be served through a market economy.

12. The programs within the configuration should allow for individualized and innovative approaches to problem solving.

While centralization of the management function often yields encouraging results, program

diversity tends to offer the same improvements with the additional advantage of easing the traumas of program institutionalization. The need for program diversity on the state level is particularly compelling.

Federal mandates or program philosophies which advocate the adoption of "one national system" of dissemination should not be encouraged.

13. Programs or projects funded as portions of the nationwide configuration should have as a goal promotion of information equity.

Educators in the United States have become quite familiar with the concept of equity as it relates to the needs and rights of women, minorities, and the handicapped. This Committee will speak of equity in a much broader context arguing that equal access to necessary information is a right of all interested in the educational process. While women and minorities have often been denied adequate access due to cultural biases, other groups on the state and national levels have been denied access because of the nature of their groupings. For example, little has been done to insure proper access of information on educational programs to textbook commissions, state, legislatures, parents, non-parents, local boards of education, ad hoc commissions, etc. While these groups may be served on request, they are usually not sought out.

The Directors would suggest that the nationwide configuration include inducements to insure that all citizens interested in the education of our children have adequate access to the information flowing through our networks.

14. The nationwide configuration should provide for a centralization of dissemination technical assistance resources for the states.

As discussed in 12 above, the general design of the configuration should be developed so as to encourage diversity; particularly at the state level. In the case of technical assistance for state dissemination programs, however, resources are so limited and desperate that centralization of these resources seems advisable.

15. The nationwide configuration should be structured in such a way as to reduce knowledge lag.

One of the more serious concerns of state dissemination directors is the lag which occurs between the time that a knowledge producer learns of a problem and the moment information is developed to solve it. An excellent example of this problem is found in the National Diffusion Network where programs are disseminated following national validation. Often by the time a program is validated a great deal of time has passed and need priorities have changed.

The nationwide configuration should be structured to reduce this lag.

16. Programs and projects within the nationwide configuration should be administered in such a way as to reduce competitive and conflicting activities.

Competition within a market economy is a useful way to insure innovation and effort; however, competition between organizations which results in duplication and conflicting efforts is dysfunctional and unnecessary.

Programs within the nationwide configuration should be designed so as to de-emphasize unnecessarily competitive conditions.

Appendix C

Assessment of Needs and Responsibilities

This section of the Directors' report details an analysis by the Select Committee relative to needs perceived by state dissemination directors. The analysis was compiled through two needs assessments, one conducted by Ms. Nancy Flott on August 25, 1978, and one conducted by the Committee as a follow-up to the Flott survey.

The first survey instrument was sent to all capacity building, special purpose, and planning grant project directors. Instrument return ran 90%. Subsequent to the mail assessment, the members of the Committee contacted each of the project directors by phone to follow-up on the returns. In this way the needs of every project state vis-a-vis dissemination were determined. The results of this initial assessment are discussed in the Committee's Interim Report on Needs (November, 1978).

The second assessment was prepared based upon a modified Delphi approach utilized by Schneider.* The needs list developed through the first survey was used as the items in the second survey. This instrument was sent to all state dissemination directors, not only those with state capacity building projects or special purpose grants. Thirty-five states responded.

For each need foil, respondents were asked to prioritize the need (from a high of five to low of one) and suggest which level of government should respond to it. The results are as follow:**

---

* Schneider, Robert M. Using the Modified Delphi to Determine Research Priorities. Research in Vocational Education Series No. 3. Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky 1975.

**Totals may not equal 100% due to multiple responses.

.EA	SEA	NIE	USOE	OTHER	High Priority			Low Priority		Priority Weight Total	Need
0	4	23	11	1	11	7	7	1	2	108	1. Insure that the states have an active role on advisory groups and planning committees by financially supporting that involvement.
0	2	27	18	1	14	8	5	1	1	120	2. NIE to coordinate with USOE the region-alization of dissemination activities.
0	8	23	21	2	22	6	1	0	0	137	3. Coordination to be brought to the variou federal dissemination programs.
1	3	20	18	0	7	7	6	7	1	96	4. An SEA dissemination reviewer to be included on the review team for all OE and NIE proposals.
1	3	20	1	0	2	8	12	3	2	86	5. Procedures established so that all NIE funded projects will send a copy of their results to SEA Dissemination staff for review and dissemination.
0	23	6	1	0	6	13	5	3	1	104	6. Dissemination Capacity Building programs focused on state board priorities.
0	5	20	14	0	15	6	3	1	3	113	7. Establishment of a program for the coordination of dissemination activities such as capacity building, regional labs, etc.
0	4	17	20	4	14	7	4	3	1	103	8. Elimination of funding for conflicting and competing dissemination activities.
0	3	17	20	8	14	9	5	0	0	121	9. Encouragement of the coordination of dissemination activities via changes in federal policy.
0	2	20	13	3	12	7	7	1	1	112	10. Provision of one flow-through mechanism for documents to be entered in the national depository (i.e. why have the same information collected by ERIC, RDx, National Center for Vocational Education, etc.)

EA	SEA	NIE	USOE	OTHER	High Priority		Low Priority			Priority Weight Total	Need
0	5	13	22	8	6	11	5	4	1	98	11. Reduction of the number of federal programs which work directly with LEAs thus preventing coordination of programs at the state level.
0	0	25	26	11	16	3	8	0	0	116	12. Reduction of the rifts and administrative animosities which exist between USOE and NIE.
0	3	24	12	2	10	8	6	2	1	105	13. Assistance to SEAs in the overall planning of state dissemination programs.
2	5	21	9	2	10	8	7	1	2	107	14. Assistance in planning and operation of dissemination programs relative to the individualization of state needs.
0	0	29	5	0	14	8	3	2	2	117	15. Continuation of the technical assistance program to the states.
0	3	23	13	0	9	12	2	4	2	109	16. Sponsored workshops and conferences for dissemination related staff with at least some portion of the expenses to be paid.
1	24	9	3	0	8	13	5	1	2	111	17. Linker training for the local level.
1	19	15	9	1	16	10	0	1	0	122	18. Provision of SEA staff development on linkage and dissemination.
0	8	25	8	1	9	10	8	0	1	110	19. Continued technical assistance, particularly for the less able states, which would provide them with access to the staff and programs of the more experienced states.

EA	SEA	NIE	USOE	OTHER	High Priority			Low Priority		Priority Weight Total	Need
0	4	23	13	1	10	11	5	3	1	116	20. Special purpose training/workshop experiences to assist SEA personnel in maintaining currency on dissemination skills/competencies and knowledge (not just a National Forum).
0	4	27	17	3	6	10	11	1	0	105	21. Technical assistance relative to advances in the field of educational information services on local, state and national level.
0	6	21	9	3	8	10	5	5	4	109	22. Provide a program of intensive inservice education on dissemination for chiefs.
0	2	26	17	1	10	12	3	5	0	117	23. National and/or regional dissemination forums with funding provided sufficient to enable two or more representatives per state to attend.
0	11	20	9	2	10	10	8	0	0	114	24. A system or procedure for the exchange of information between and among SEAs.
0	2	25	5	2	7	10	4	6	0	99	25. Specific program activities to improve NIE's communication with the chiefs.
0	9	23	6	2	7	6	11	2	0	96	26. Specific program activities to improve communication between and among the project directors.
1	11	24	11	2	5	11	8	3	0	99	27. Provision of interaction opportunities for those involved in dissemination.
0	0	25	8	1	5	6	10	3	3	88	28. More special purpose dissemination gran
0	0	19	14	1	9	2	9	3	1	87	29. Provision for formula based funding for dissemination.

EA	SEA	NIE	USOE	OTHER	High Priority				Low Priority	Priority Weight Total	Need
0	4	19	16	2	6	3	6	7	3	77	30. Provision of federal match with SEAs for educational linkage agents.
0	1	21	9	1	4	5	8	4	4	76	31. Support for the continued operational costs of user assessment data collection and report preparation.
0	5	8	24	2	12	7	3	1	2	101	32. Financial support for dissemination through an annual allocation of Title V funds.
0	1	23	7	0	5	4	3	2	1	90	33. Expansion of the Regional Exchange program.
0	1	22	15	0	11	6	6	2	1	102	34. Federal maintenance dollars for state dissemination management.
0	0	25	5	1	9	5	9	2	0	96	35. Maintain and increase services provided through ERIC.
1	2	25	7	1	10	3	6	5	2	92	36. Support of institutionalized capacity building programs through the provisior of ERIC materials free of charge.
0	2	23	11	1	10	8	5	1	2	101	37. Free access to various educational data bases.
0	2	26	6	0	6	9	5	5	1	92	38. A "menu" of activities/efforts which NIE would fund to states based upon a direct state match.
0	1	18	17	3	5	5	5	9	2	80	39. A program for giving "credit" to states for certain services in dissemination.
0	8	12	9	1	3	3	8	3	4	61	40. Programs emphasizing transformation activities.

.EA	SEA	NIE	USOE	OTHER	High Priority			Low Priority		Priority Weight Total	Need
0	3	16	18	1	10	4	10	0	0	96	41. Computerization of the nationally validated programs.
0	10	14	10	0	3	2	12	4	2	69	42. Development of the state extension agent concept.
2	10	18	10	0	7	11	5	0	0	94	43. Continued development of the resource base.
0	9	15	8	0	4	4	11	4	2	79	44. Continued development of the state extension agent program.
0	9	19	9	1	5	8	8	3	1	88	45. Research and development on dissemination activities being conducted at the state level.
0	4	21	10	0	6	8	7	3	0	89	46. Support services, such as a clearinghouse for state developed material and file building.
6	17	9	7	1	7	8	6	2	0	89	47. Linkage of the dissemination program to change strategies on the state and local level.
3	19	7	8	0	5	5	8	5	1	80	48. Expansion of SEA dissemination responsibility to include non-educators (e.g. parents, community groups).
1	7	20	3	0	8	6	6	3	0	88	49. Evaluation of the results of the state capacity building.
4	9	15	10	0	10	7	4	1	1	93	50. Programs emphasizing utilization activities.
0	11	15	8	1	4	8	10	2	3	89	51. Initiation of R&D dissemination programs centered on distinct educational client groups (e.g. early childhood teachers or teachers of the basic skill:

EA	SEA	NIE	USOE	OTHER	High Priority			Low Priority		Priority Weight Total	Need
2	6	19	8	1	3	6	9	6	3	89	52. Development of an improved knowledge base relative to special techniques for disseminating information to urban areas.
6	24	9	5	5	0	8	10	0	1	63	53. Programs for building capacity at the local level.
0	13	17	12	0	5	10	9	4	1	101	54. Funds for intra-state dissemination activities.
0	3	20	12	1	9	4	12	0	3	100	55. National promising programs-practices file.
0	11	19	15	0	7	12	8	3	0	113	56. Programs which encourage dissemination by means other than print.
6	24	10	8	0	8	13	6	2	0	114	57. A program to inform new teachers of services offered through dissemination.
0	3	18	17	0	4	5	11	4	5	86	58. Provision for the analysis and discussion of the need for national validatio of promising practices.

When the priority weight totals are used for rank ordering the following priority list is developed:

Priority	Need	Question No.	Weight
1	Coordination be brought to the various federal dissemination programs.	3	137
2	Provision of SEA staff development on linkage and dissemination	18	122
3	Encouragement of the coordination of dissemination activities via changes in federal policy	9	121
4	NIE to coordinate with USOE the regionalization of dissemination activities	2	120
5	Continuation of the technical assistance program to the states	15	117(111)*
6	National and/or regional dissemination forums with funding provided sufficient to enable two or more representatives per state to attend	23	117(107)
7	Reduction of the rifts and administrative animosities which exist between NIE and USOE	12	116(116)
8	Special purpose training/ workshop experiences to assist SEA personnel in maintaining currency on dissemination skills/competencies and knowledge (not just a National Forum)	20	116(109)
9	A system or procedure for the exchange of information between and among SEAs	24	114(114)
10	A program to inform new teachers of services offered through dissemination	57	114(110)

*Ties were broken by dropping low and near low priority scores and comparing results. The adjusted score is included in parenthesis.

Priority	Need	Question No.	Weight
11	Establishment of a program for the coordination of dissemination activities such as capacity building, regional labs, etc.	7	113
12	Programs which encourage dissemination by means other than print	56	113
13	Provision of one flow-through mechanism for documents to be entered in the national depository (i.e. why have the same information collected by ERIC, RDx, National Center for Vocational Education, etc.)	10	112
14	Linker training for the local level	17	111
15	Continued technical assistance, particularly for the less able states, which would provide them with access to the staff and programs of the more experienced states	19	110

The five lowest priority needs according to the survey were:

58	Programs emphasizing transformation activities	40	61
57	Programs for building capacity at the local level	53	63
56	Development of the state extension agent concept	42	69
55	Support for the continued operational costs of user assessment data collection and report preparation	31	76
54	Provision of federal match with SEAs for educational linkage agents	30	77

It would seem that the results of the second assessment match the results of the first with dissemination directors placing high priority on programs which would promote coordination at the federal level, offer technical assistance to the states, and provide for

improved communication between and among the states.

On the other hand, the directors seem to place low priority on federal extension agents who would serve the states, user assessment data collection, and limited impact programs.

When the high priority items are checked as to responding agency, we find that the project directors suggest the following breakdown of responsibility:

Priority	Need	To be met by
1	Coordination be brought to federal programs	NIE/USOE*
2	SEA staff development on linkage and dissemination	SEA/NIE
3	Encouragement of coordination of dissemination activities through federal policy changes	USOE/NIE
4	NIE and USOE coordinate regionalization activities	NIE/USOE
5	Continuation of technical assistance to the states	NIE
6	National and/or regional dissemination forums	NIE/USOE
7	Reduction of rifts between USOE and NIE	USOE/NIE
8	Special training/workshop experiences for SEA staff	NIE/USOE
9	Exchange of information between and among SEAs	NIE/SEA
10	Inform new teachers of services offered	SEA
11	Coordinate current dissemination programs	NIE/USOE
12	Programs which encourage dissemination by means other than print	NIE/USOE/SEA

*Ordered by survey results. First agency named given most responsibility.

Priority	Need	To be met by
13	Provision of flow-through mechanism	NIE/USOE
14	Linker training at local level	SEA
15	Continued technical assistance with experiences states aiding inexperienced states	NIE

It seems rather clear from these results that state dissemination directors feel that USOE and NIE should play the major role in coordinating federal dissemination programs. The implication is that once the program reaches the state level current policies and regulations prevent coordination in the most efficient way. It is also rather clear that the project directors see technical assistance in dissemination being a major responsibility of NIE. Programs operating in the field or addressed to individual teachers are seen as state responsibilities.

When responsibilities are factored from need we get a clearer idea of the roles the directors suggest for actors in the nationwide configuration:

LEAs

#47. Linkage of the dissemination program to change strategies on the state and local level.

#53. Programs for building capacity at the local level.

#57. A program to inform new teachers of services offered through dissemination.

#50. Programs emphasizing utilization activities.

#48. Expansion of SEA dissemination responsibility to include non-educators.

SEAs

#53. Programs for building capacity at the local level.

#17. Linker training for the local level.

#57. A program to inform new teachers of services offered through dissemination

#6. Dissemination Capacity building programs focused on state board priorities.

#47. Linkage of the dissemination program to change strategies at the state and local level.

NIE

#15. Continuation of the technical assistance program to the states.

#2. NIE to coordinate with USOE the regionalization of dissemination activities.

#21. Technical assistance relative to advances in the field of educational information services or local, state and national level.

#38. A "menu" of activities/efforts which NIE would fund to states based upon a direct state match.

#25. Specific program activities to improve NIE's communication with the chiefs.

USOE

#12. Reduction of rifts and animosities which exist between USOE and NIE.

#32. Financial support for dissemination through an annual allocation of Title V funds.

#11. Reduction of the number of federal programs which work directly with LEAs thus preventing coordination of programs at the state level.

#3. Coordination to be brought to the various federal dissemination programs.

#58. Provision for the analysis and discussion of the need for national validation of promising practices.